Establishment of a Training Center for Infant-Toddler Care:

Evaluation Report

Home Economics Center for Research
Technical Report Number 3

TX
173
T290
no.3
c.1

ESTABLISHMENT OF A TRAINING CENTER FOR INFANT-TODDLER CARE: EVALUATION REPORT

Recorded and written by:

Roby Kerr

Lorenz Villeponteaux, Jr.

J. Allen Watson

Technical report, no.3

June, 1972

Home Economics Center for Research
The University of North Carolina at Greensboro

Introduction

The Home Economics Center for Research contracted with Dr. Mary Elizabeth Keister to evaluate the "Establishment of a Training Center for Infant-Toddler Care." The project took place during the first half of 1972, ending in June 1972.

The major purpose of the project was to provide training for persons involved in the delivery of services to infants and toddlers, i.e., administrators, supervisors, planners, consultants, and others.

The purpose was implemented in terms of three specific goals:

(a) To provide a variety of training opportunities in the field of infant-toddler care.

(b) To produce materials that can be used in training persons who are involved in infant-toddler programs.

(c) To develop techniques for evaluating the effectiveness of various training materials and methods on a pilot basis.

Such a training project was a logical and natural extension of Dr. Keister's program. The Demontration Nursery Center for Infants and Toddlers has been in operation since 1967 and has been recognized internally for its excellence and pioneering accomplishments. Since it is generally agreed that child-care services--especially those for infants and toddlers--are both qualitatively and quantitatively inadequate to meet the need, there is a substantial gap to be filled in terms of training of personnel to staff and manage service programs. The staff of the Demonstration Nursery possessed collectively a wealth of valuable experience and know-how which needed to be transmitted to others in the field. Only the training aspects of the Program were evaluated as they related to the three goals cited above.

450748

Method

The general design used to evaluate this project was quasi-experimental (Campbell and Stanley, 1963) and was selected in order to obtain maximum feedback from the short term training experiences. Specifically, a modified time-series approach was applied to Dr. Keister's training efforts as they evolved.

Due to the short duration of the project, no before and after measures were taken. Both hard and soft data were collected, and emphasis was placed upon feedback from participants and project personnel regarding the training experience. Trained observers attended virtually all training sessions in order to obtain evaluation data.

The evaluation focused primarily on the educational processes as they took place, particularly emphasizing leader-participant interactions.

The evaluation was comprised of three main parts, each relating to an objective of the Training Center. These objectives were: (a) workshop, (b) training materials, and (c) evaluation technique development and assessment. Each objective is listed below along with measures, instruments, and methodological comments pertinent to that objective. Taken together this list comprises the plan for evaluation.

Objective 1. To train three groups of up to 30 persons each in programming, training, and consultation concerning the essential needs of infants and toddlers.

Measures:

(a) Dynamic analysis of the process of each workshop group as a whole. Clinical judgments made during each group session as to the predominant level of group functioning for that session. Both Bion (1959) and Kindelsperger (1956, 1957) were used as

guidelines for judgments.

(b) Analysis of leader-participant interactions during each session. Rating of interactions according to Flanders' schema (1960, 1967) were performed. Each rating covered a 15 minute segment.

(c) Rating of attention paid by participant to learning task. Time-on-task was rated as "involved," "moderately involved," or "uninvolved" for each participant during 20-second observation periods.

(d) Internal versus external locus of control for each participant. Locus of control was determined for each individual by his score on Rotter's (1966) 29-item test of paired comparisons.

(e) A daily log or running account of daily events was kept by Center personnel. Included were leaders' estimates of participant response to workshop.

(f) Participants' assessments of content usefulness and leader effectiveness were obtained through a 14-item Likert scale completed by participants.

(g) Participants' assessment of usefulness of workshop experience after returning to the job. A nine-item Likert scale was mailed to each workshop participant two weeks after he returned home.

Objective 2. To produce, as well as provide from other sources, training materials pertaining to quality care and education for infants and toddlers.

Measures:

(a) A 10-item Likert-type questionnaire was administered to participants for their individual assessment of the usefulness of selected publications.

Objective 3. To determine appropriate techniques for use in evaluating the learning process as it takes place in the Training Center.

Measures:

(a) Subjective assessment of techniques and instruments by evaluation team followed each training event (e.g. workshop) and the conclusion of the entire evaluation period. In assessing a specific procedure attention was paid to such things as efficiency, amount of information obtained, obtrusiveness into learning process, and so forth.

This report presents a general summary of findings for each of the three workshops, and then a summary and conclusions section for the evaluation as a whole.

Workshop V (April 10 - 14, 1972) focused on Family Day Care.

The Participants

Of the 13 participants in the Workshop, four were male and nine female. They ranged in age from 22 years to 56 years with six younger than 30 years and six over 40 years. Three women were more than 50 years of age. Eight participants were married, four single, and one divorced. Six had no children of their own while of the seven who had children, five had three or more.

Five participants were from North Carolina; six were from the Philadelphia, Pennsylvania area; one each came from Florida and Texas.

Ten of the participants were affiliated with child care programs, while two were from the Department of Social Services and one was with the Learning Institute of North Carolina. The group was heavily weighted with individuals who had had considerable experience and education in the field. Ten had had more than three years of related experience, and three had had more than ten years experience. Eleven held college degrees, eight of which were related to child care. Four held related graduate degrees. Consistent with these backgrounds was the fact that only three of the participants were involved in direct service to children as their primary responsibility. The remaining ten were involved in supervisory (5), administrative (3), and training functions (2). In terms of secondary responsibilities only two were in direct service, with four in supervisory work, five in administrative activities, and two in other work.

Results

Materials

Four UNC-G publications on child care were assigned for evaluation by the participants--What Parents Should Look For, A Demonstration Project: The

Good Life for Infants and Toddlers, Health Is Everything, and Assuring Safety and Protecting Health. There was a high degree of agreement among the participants. Their ratings of all four publications fell predominantly in the high and moderately high categories. Specifically, this means that the materials were felt to be clear, concise, and useful to all levels of personnel involved in child care. The majority considered the content to be at their level, rather than above or below them.

In spite of the concensus demonstrated by these ratings, several minor disagreements should be mentioned. While there was a high degree of agreement that What Parents Should Look For was useful for less trained and less experienced personnel, at least two of the group questioned the value of the materials to trained caregivers, administrators, supervisors, or trainers. In apparent consistency with this assessment, four participants rated the materials as below their level.

Three of the group expressed some doubt through their ratings that The Good Life could be digested by inexperienced caregivers. Two participants exhibited a similar doubt regarding the material's usefulness to mothers and untrained care-givers. Two participants expressed doubt that Assuring Safety would have value for administrators. The same reservation was indicated by two regarding Health Is Everything.

Workshop

Two attention measures were taken on the second day of the Workshop. Both sets of observations demonstrated moderate levels of attention. In each set seven persons were rated as involved. In the first set four were rated as moderately involved and two as uninvolved. In the second set five were judged to moderately involved while one person left the room. This level of attention cannot be considered as substantial since nearly half of

the group was consistently at the moderate and uninvolved level.

On the second day a single assessment of content usefulness and leader effectiveness was made. The presentation pertained to health and was made by a public health nurse. Only five of the 13 participants responded to the questionnaire. Four of the five who completed the forms rated the session as highly to moderately appropriate for themselves and others. The remaining respondant considered the content of the session as below her level, and inappropriate for her and her job. She did feel the presentation to be highly appropriate for less experienced personnel. How the remaining participants might have rated the session is a matter for conjecture, and yet it is questionable that they would have given high ratings. The fact that eight participants failed to answer the questionnaire is significant and conveys in itself a type of negative response.

Interaction analyses were obtained on the first, second, and fourth days. On the first day the interactions consisted of numerous demanding questions initiated by the participants and followed by leaders' attempts to answer. These interchanges were a persistent interruption of attemppts to lecture. During one fifteen-minute observation period there were nine attempts to continue the presentation while 42 questions were asked and 34 answers given. In the second fifteen-minute period there were 18 attempts to lecture with 47 questions and 40 answers.

During the observation period on the second day the amount of interaction decreased considerably and remained at a low level on succeeding days. There were four attempts to continue with the prepared talk with 22 participant-initiated statements and 10 responding comments from leaders. Two observation periods on the fourth day demonstrated the continuation of the trend toward fewer interactions. Attempts to continue the presentation were

11 and 5 while student-initiated talk decreased to 11 and 8.

The repeated attempts to lecture were ill-fated when one considers the persistence of the participants to take control of the Workshop, first through demanding questions and then through declarations of their own truth and authority. The main consequence in terms of interaction was an overall lessening of interaction. Such a decrease is just the opposite of what might be expected as such a meeting progresses. Kindelsperger (1957) proposed that one useful indicator of good group leadership and good group functioning is the inverse progression over time of decreasing leader activity and increasing participant activity.

In addition to these findings, an analysis of the observations of the group as a whole, the log kept by leaders, and the Rotter (internal-external locus of control) test yielded useful information.

Although the group-as-a-whole measure and the log were kept independently, there was substantial agreement between them. The group was rated as dependent, self-protective, and seeking orientation on the first morning. Individuals kept their distance from one another except for some pairing based on prior relationships. There was little eye contact between participants except for furtive glances. There was little verbal exchange between them. The primary relationships could be characterized as dependent, i.e., each individual seeking vigorously to have <u>all</u> of his questions answered immediately by the leader. The log mentioned difficulty presenting material to the group because of "torrents of questions."

By the first afternoon the group's questions began to take the form of challenging the authorities. Many participants began taking exception to the leaders' statements and stating their own truths. The group was rated as being counter-dependent and ready for conflict. The Rotter scale was explained

and assigned.

Five participants (all from the same locality) were 45 minutes late on the second morning. At the end of the lecture the participants shifted the discussion to several issues totally unrelated to the lecture topic. The group was rated as testing, conflict-oriented, and counter-dependent. By the end of the morning session there had been several complaining comments by participants which revealed a need to have a group discussion of the matter.

The first hour of the afternoon session was devoted to a very angry expression of feeling by the group about the evaluation, in general, and the Rotter scale, in particular. The most vocal individuals were those who had been late that morning. They resented being made to violate their principles, as they viewed it, through the forced-choice test. They called the test "worthless" and "stupid." Further, they felt their privacy had been invaded by the personal revelations in the test and on other evaluation forms. Co-operating in the evaluation seemed to them inconsistent with having paid a fee to attend the Workshop. They assumed that the evaluators had come "from HEW." This misunderstanding irritated them all the more.

Although they agreed with some of the hostile comments, several of the other participants expressed their acceptance of evaluation and accountability as a reality of life for all programs. The angry sub-group was far better organized and outspoken, however, and they held their ground.

The staff and the evaluation team decided to lessen the demands on the group for evaluation and to destroy the Rotter scales which had been completed. These concessions were made in order to enhance the learning possiblities during the remaining days of the Workshop.

Approximately one-hald of the group continued to be active in attention and discussion throughout the Workshop. But as already noted, the overall amount of interaction continued downward. By the fourth day only seven

participants were present at the start of the afternoon session with two late arrivals. Four did not attend at all. The absentees represented the early departure of several from the angry sub-group. The sub-group members who did attend participated only through criticism, attempts to teach others, and whispers among themselves. Two others returned home prior to the Friday session.

In summary, four UNC-G publications were rated by the participants as clear, concise, written at their level, and useful to a wide range of child care personnel.

About one-half of the group participated fully in the Workshop. This portion of the group appeared to benefit from the activities and to leave with good feelings about the experience. The other half of the group participated sporadically, became dissatisfied early in the Workship, and remained so throughout. Three factors appear to have contributed to the difficulties during Workshop V, as follows: (a) inappropriate expectations on the part of several participants, (b) overloading and personal invasion of participants with evaluation activities and (c) uneven performance by Workshop presenters.

Several things were learned regarding evaluation techniques. These will be enumerated in the overall evaluation summary; however, several specific changes in approach should be mentioned at this point. Early attempts were made in subsequent Workshops to clarify the content of the Workshops and the necessity of evaluation in order to avoid unsatisfiable expectations. In addition, care was taken in the further evaluation efforts to insure anonymity of participants and to decrease the overall evaluation load placed on them. Finally, subsequent Workshops focused on infant-toddler program development, training, and consultation. This focus utilized to better advantage the strengths of the staff of the Demonstration Nursery Center for Infants and Toddlers.

TABLE 1

Education and Job Responsibility of Participants
May Workshop

Education	Job Responsibility	
8	Administration	7
8	Supervision	13
12	Direct Child Care	12
4	Teaching	10
2		
34		34

TABLE 1

Education and Job Responsibility of Participants
May Workshop

Education		Job Responsibility	
High School	8	Administration	7
Some College	8	Supervision	5
College Graduate	12	Direct Child Care	12
Graduate Work	4	Teaching	10
Doctoral Degree	2		
Totals	34		34

Several types of measures were used to evaluate the workshop. Measures of attention or time on task were taken on a time series basis. Each person participating in the workshop was measured a number of times for periods of twenty seconds. If he was looking at the leader for at least seven (7) of the ten seconds he was scored as "involved" on the check sheet. If he was looking at the leader for five (5) seconds to seven (7) seconds he was scored as "moderately involved." If less than five (5) seconds he was scored as "uninvolved."

A modified Flanders Interaction Analysis was also used. This was actually used as something of a tracking sheet for verbalizations by both leaders and participants, and included the type of verbalization uttered, i.g., question, statement, lecture, and so forth.

Since a great many materials were presented to the participants they were asked to rate anonymously several pieces of material which were produced by the staff of the Infant-Toddler Project. The ratings reflected the usefulness and level of the material for various persons who might be engaged in day care work.

The data for attention or time-on-task measures were taken nine (9) times during the course of the week. Table 2, which summarizes these data, indicates that the participants were attending during the sessions nearly 90% of the time. On the other hand, less than 2% of the time were people uninvolved in the sessions. This was somewhat surprising in view of the fact that educational level and job responsibility were so varied among the participants. In other words, one would expect persons at one extreme or the other to be bored.

TABLE 2

Attention Measures by Number and Percent of Participants

Measure	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Total
Involved	30	31	33	28	17	18	28	25	22	232
	94%	86%	92%	85%	85%	86%	93%	83%	92%	88.5%
Moderately Involved	2	3	3	4	3	3	2	4	2	26
	6%	8%	8%	12%	15%	14%	7%	13%	8%	9.9%
Uninvolved	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	4
	-	6%	-	3%	-	-	-	3%	-	1.6%

Scoring on the modified Flanders Interaction Analysis was quite revealing, especially when considered in light of an assessment of the total group functioning. The first scores on this measure were obtained on Tuesday, the second morning of the workshop. There were 42 verbalizations during the 15 minute sampling period. Over half of these were uttered by leaders (22 in all). In contrast to this, on the final day of the workshop, Friday, a total of 46 interactions were recorded, with the participants accounting for over half (25) of these.

Although the mere counting of verbalizations does not necessarily reveal the nature of the interactions which are going on in the group, the increase by the participants suggests that they were more involved in the sessions.

The materials assessed by the participants in this workshop were two pieces which were produced by staff of the Infant-Toddler project, the ABC's of Learning in Infancy and Health is.....Everything. Eighty-one percent of the responses to the questionnaire indicated that the former was written At the level of the participants while 11% indicated the material was Below the level of the participants. Ninety-six percent of the participants rated the latter piece of material At their level. Regarding usefulness of the materials, 86% of the participants rated the two pieces highly useful. General concensus was that the material was quite concise and useful to a great many persons who are involved in the various aspects of day care.

The participants were also asked to rate the workshop in terms of the overall content usefulness and leader effectiveness. The ratings were done on a scale of one (1) to five (5), with a rating of one (1) for excellent and five (5) for poor. Means were computed for five questions for the total group. Table 3 shows the results of the ratings. It is clear that the results of this measure indicate a quite positive feeling on the part of the respondents regarding this workshop.

TABLE 3

Mean Scores of Ratings by Participants on Content Usefulness and Leader Effectiveness

	Mean
1. Appropriateness of Content	1.68
2. Content Usefulness	1.19
3. Content Clarity	1.19
4. Enough opportunity to discuss	1.46
5. Enough opportunity to ask questions	1.31

Group Functioning. In the space of five days it is difficult to make an assessment of group functioning and progress in any real depth. This difficulty is compounded considerably when the members form a heterogeneous group, as in the case of the participants in this workshop. Put another way, group progress is relatively slow even when the members share the same type of problem or the same area of interest and come to the group with essentially the same backgrounds.

In this particular group, as in all other initial group meetings, some time was given over to orientation. In short, each person has to assess his position in relation to each other group member as well as to the group as a whole. This training group for the most part remained in this self-protective stage throughout the week. This was especially true of those members with the least amount of training, education, and experience. In fact, a few of them truly withdrew from or never entered into the interaction of the sessions.

A few members of the group advanced to the point where they began to test out their ideas, at times disagreeing with each other or with the leaders. Those who moved in this direction did so by the end of the second day. However, little movement could be seen beyond this point. In other words, no real group spirit emerged, no group identity surfaced.

It should be noted that there was no overt conflict among group members; nor was there any real discomfort revealed by the group members, although it was certainly possible that some members felt mild discomfort because they were not able to become involved in the interaction.

A word should be said about the leaders of the workshop. It was clear that the participants in the workshop varied their verbalizations and interactions, both quantity and quality, with the variation in leaders. It was also very clear that when Dr. Keister was acting as leader and interacting

with the group, participant interaction was highest. This should not become a personal assessment of Dr. Keister, it is realized, but group interaction increased so markedly at certain times that it was imperative that it be mentioned.

By the end of the week it was obvious to the careful observer that certain members of the group had been saturated while others were still eager for more. It can be reasoned that, among other factors, this was accounted for in terms of the reason that each participant came to the workshop, i.e., what his expectations were.

WORKSHOP VII

Workshop VII (June 5 - 9, 1972) was entitled "Infant-Toddler Care--Training and Consultation."

The Participants

Seventeen attending the Workshop were female and only one was male. The age range was from 21 years to 64 years. Five were 25 years or younger, eight were 30 years or younger, and eight were over 40 years of age. Five were more than 50 years of age. Eight of the group were married, four divorced, two single, two separated, one widowed, and one failed to respond. One participant had one child of her own, three had three of their own children, eight had two children, three had one child, two had none, and one failed to respond.

North Carolina was the residence of eleven persons, while two came from Virginia, two from Pennsylvania, and one each from Georgia, Missouri, and Arkansas.

Twelve of the participants represented child care programs while two held positions with the Department of Social Services, one was from a Model Cities program, one taught Early Childhood Education, and one did not reply.

The group was a highly trained one, with six holding related graduate degrees, while six held college degrees (only one of which was from an ...

unrelated field), five had attended technical institutes, and one held a high school diploma.

One-third (6) of the group was primarily involved in direct service to children. This number is somewhat higher than might be expected considering the topic of the Workshop and the substantial amount of education in the group. Three primarily functioned as supervisors, four as administrators, two as coordinators, one as a trainer, one in research, and one no response. Six rated supervision as their secondary responsibility, two rated direct service, two rated administration, two were program monitors, one was a program evaluator, and four did not respond.

Amount of experience in child care among the group was consistent with the large number involved in direct service. Four had less than one year of experience, and seven had two years or less. Four had three to five years experience, four had six to ten years, and three had more that ten years experience.

Results

Workshop

Attention. Improved rater techniques allowed more thorough and efficient measurement of participants attention. Repeated measures were taken on the first four days of the Workshop. Attention remained at a high level througout the Workshop. The group ranged from a high of 94% involved during the second morning's program on staffing to a low of 67% attention on the third afternoon when parental involvement was the topic. The average number of participants involved in any one session was 13.2, while the average number moderately involved was less than 2.5 and the number uninvolved was less than .5. The average involvement by participants for all sessions was 82 %. It should be cardfully noted by the reader that the stringent measures

have been used here, i.e. lack of involvement was found by combining both the moderately involved and uninvolved categories. If the moderately involved category were combined with the involved category or dropped from consideration altogether (as is often done), the resulting involvement scores would be consistently at the 100% level.

Skillful recruitment by the staff and self-selection by individual participants continued to play a role. With predictable regularity, the participants who had lowest attention scores were those caregivers with little in the way of experience, training, or job responsibility which would sustain interest or comprehension regarding several of the Workshop topics.

Interaction. Flanders Interaction Analysis was performed on the second, third, fourth days of the Workshop. The technique of asking questions of the participants went virtually unused by leaders except for the third afternoon.

The lecture technique was regularly utilized at a moderate level with the exception of the third and fourth afternoons when it was employed heavily. Actually, the fourth morning began with a lengthy lecture segment involving no other type of interaction. But Dr. Keister recognized the loss of interest by the group. She shifted topics slightly and encouraged discussion. As a consequence of her encouragement and of the growing feeling of comfort among the participants good discussions developed on both occasions. The highest number of participant comments occurred at these times. Such a shift toward the end of the Workshop toward participant activity over leader activity is consistent with more effective leadership and group functioning (Kindelsperger, 1957). Also extremely appropriate for a group at this level of competence is the high ratio of participant statements over participant questions. These people asked questions of authorities in areas where the authorities could be useful, but they also were encouraged by Dr. Keister to recognize and utilize

the amount of expertise available in the form of fellow group members. Dr. Keister on numerous occasions made considerable effort to see that pertinent knowledge of various group members was made available to the entire group. This technique appeared to come from a security within her which allowed a particular stance on her part to the effect that "I know some things and am glad to share them with you; but you know some valuable things, too, and there is no threat to me in your sharing your knowledge with the group." One statistic which demonstrates this approach in Workshop VII was the persistent high frequency of accepting and using ideas of participants.

Content Usefulness and leader effectiveness. On the afternoon of the fourth day each participant was asked to assess anonymously the content and leadership of the entire Workshop. No statistical analyses were required in order to determine conclusively that the vast majority of scores fell within the most favorable categories. Specifically, this means that the participants were in considerable agreement on the clarity of content, responsiveness of leaders to their concerns, opportunity for discussion and questions, and the appropriateness and usefulness on the job to them and a wide range of child care personnel. All but one participant felt the Workshop was presented at their level. Although the group's overall enthusiasm for the content and leadership of Workshop VII is clear, the minor exceptions seem worthy of discussion. A small minority of the respondents expressed doubt that portions of the Workshop were appropriate for untrained caregivers, inexperienced caregivers, or mothers caring for their own or others' children. Such an opinion seems quite reasonable and defensible considering work responsibilities (training, co-ordinating, administrating, supervising) to which the conference was geared. Add to this the fact that virtually all of the highly trained, highly experienced participants found the sessions valuable, and it becomes

doubtful that the least trained and least experienced personnel could benefit equally well. If it were not more difficult to admit that content was "above me" than to state that content was "below me," more than one of the younger participants might have revealed the former reaction.

In the space provided for additional comments, several of the participants took the time to add words of praise for the Workshop. Generally, they referred to the interesting way in which material was presented and the conviction that much they had learned would be valuable on the job. Two participants felt the Workshop could have been completed in less time, while one felt the breaks for relaxation were advantageous.

Group as a whole. Attendance and promptness by participants at sessions was persistently good.

The group warmed up slowly to most activities on the first afternoon. As was the case each time the slide series "Hidden Treasure" had been shown, the group's attention was extremely high.

On the second morning the group was quiet and restless at first. They seemed reserved, not deeply involved. The communication was from leader to participant only for the first half hour. Dr. Keister apparently recognized this and stimulated a discussion. At this point another leader led the continuing discussion. The discussion deteriorated somewhat as the leader reverted to an authoritative stance. This stance placed the participants in a subordinate role and attenuated discussion. But by showing positive regard for the participants and respect for their ideas, the discussion flourished. Some individuals asked questions to be answered by leaders. Others quite appropriately offered their own views on the topic.

The foregoing sequence occurred frequently during the Workshop. The group was rated as vacillating between the first two stages of group development--between dependency and counter-dependency, between orientation and testing.

By the second afternoon the group was able to move toward much more openness, less self-protection. Common areas of interest became clarified. A high level of involvement in sharing ideas occurred. Even a spirited, healthy conflict arose concerning college credit and better pay for paraprofessionals. No animosity was present. The group was rated as shifting between conflict and emerging group identification.

The third morning was spent viewing films and perusing publications. On that afternoon involvement seemed slow to develop, but had regained its high level by 2:30 p.m. when more than half the group was participating actively in discussion with the nurse and teacher.

On the fourth morning Dr. Keister recognized that her lecture was losing the audience after a while. She shifted to a more appealing aspect of the topic; interest increased noticeably. The nurse kept her talk brief and to the point. She then involved the group in a vigorous discussion which evolved into a time of mutual sharing of ideas by peers.

By the fourth afternoon the individuals seemed to still be seeking their roles in the group, but with considerable eomfort. Interest in the health care topic was good but later waned due to fatigue of the group.

Very seldom during the Workshop was the sub-group of young caregivers able to become thoroughly absorbed in the activities. Even with direct encouragement from the leaders on several occasions, they felt too uncomfortable to participate in discussions.

In summary, 18 persons participated in Workshop VII. The professionals participated most fully and seemed to benefit more than did the paraprofessionals. Attention was extremely high throughout the week. The slide presentation and concise lectures which led to discussion were the most productive form of interaction. The group as a whole had developed comfortable relationships and were moving toward identification with the group when the Workshop ended. Participants expressed unanimous praise for the Workshop as a whole.

Participants expressed unanimous praise for the Workshop as a whole.

Conclusion

Workshops

Workshop V on Family Day Care was the least successful of the three Workshops; however, at least one-half of its 13 participants gave evidence of deep positive involvement in the sessions. It may be that other participants benefitted significantly, too, but most indicators suggested that several experienced dissatisfaction during much of the Workshop.

Three factors appeared to contribute to the problem, including: (a) inappropriate expectations by participants, (b) overloading of participants by evaluation efforts, and (c) uneven presentation by leaders. Steps were taken to remedy these matters. More care was taken to prepare participants in advance regarding the content of subsequent Workshops. The evaluation team lessened the burden on participants and increased the anonymity of participants during measurement activities. Subsequent Workshops focused on infant-toddler care, a topic more directly related to the expertise of the Center staff.

Workshop VI on Program Essentials of Infant-Toddler Care must be regarded as highly successful in terms of all the measures taken as well as in terms of overall, global assessment of the sessions by observers. The only negative feature had to do with the uninvolvement of some of the least trained and least experienced participants.

Workshop VII on Training and Consultation Aspects of Infant-Toddler Care was highly successful. All indices pointed to a high degree of involvement on the part of all professional participants. Although several measures suggested a lesser degree of involvement by the four paraprofessionals, some measures indicated significant benefits to these participants, as well.

Growing out of the observations involved in collecting the evaluation data and out of a study of those data, several comments should be made in reference to effectiveness of specific matters which cut across all three Workshops.

There seem to be a number of advantages to including in a single Workshop participants from a wide range of programs and geographic areas. The various viewpoints and experiences provide a valuable mix and contrast of ideas. On the other hand, too much heterogeneity in terms of educational level and level of work responsibility appear to lead to inefficient use of manpower. If the leaders present material predominnantly at the level of one segment of the group, the other segment of the group finds much that is below her level of need, inapprpriate to her work role, or beyond her ability to comprehend. It would seem to be more efficient to hold somewhat more rigidly to a set of criteria for participants in these respects.

The provision of variety of experiences in the course of a given Workshop proved to be valuable. A number of the participants commented on this matter specifically. By mixing didactic sessions with visual aids, literature, site visits, free time, and so forth, much was accomplished. "Hidden Treasure," a slide series, always seemed to be welcomed to the groups.

Of even more importance to the functioning of the group, however, seemed to be the attitude of particular leaders regarding their role in relation to the participants. Differences in this role concept were quickly sensed by participants, acting either as impediments or enhancements to involvement. The most effective approaches seemed to be one of a brief introductory lecture followed by open discussion of the topic or a talk by the leader which was so informal that it invited repeated episodes of discussion.

Such an approach can be characterized in terms of learner-centered

learning as opposed to teacher-centered learning. A learner-centered approach demonstrates more respect for the learner and places more responsibility upon him for the learning process. The learner-centered approach would seem to be useful with groups of young children and appears to be essential with older, highly-trained professionals. To take an authoritative stance of attempting to answer all of their questions is doomed from the outset.

Dr. Keister, a recognized expert in her field, embodied the learner-centered approach. Her insistence on use of the term "participant" throughout this evaluation is but one example of the respect for other persons and their ideas which permeated all three Workshops. If other leaders retreated into the authority role, Dr. Deister was always quick to inject some bit of respect for a learner or the group of learners which produced deeper involvement.

Assessment of Workshops by participants after returning home.

Short, anonymous follow-up questionnaires were sent to the participants of Workshops VI and VII. Only 35% were returned even though stamped, self-addressed envelopes were included in mail-out, and the mail-out followed the workshop by no more than two weeks. The great majority of the returns came from administrators and supervisors (58%). The results of the answers to the questions are summarized in Table 4. Some of the more pertinent findings are summarized as follows:

1. Nearly 95% of the respondents agreed that they obtained the kind of information they anticipating receiving (Question 4.).

2. All respondents agreed that generally the presentations by leaders were clear (Question 8.)

3. The most valuable session was thought to be the one on health care by 37% of the respondents (Question 5.).

4. Regarding the level of presentation, 74% agreed that material was presented at their level, while 21% (there were 5% no response to this

TABLE 4

Summar of Responses to Follow-Up Questionnaire

Job Responsibility:	Administration	Supervision	Teaching	Care Giving	Other
	7 (37%)	4 (21%)	3 (16%)	3 (16%)	2 (10%)
Educational Level:	H.S. or Less	Some College	College Grad.	Graduate Work	Graduate Degree
	2	2	8	2	5
Did you obtain the kind of information you anticipating receiving?			Yes	No	
			18	1	
Most valuable session:	All Good	Health	Observations	Administration	Other
	2	7	3	4	3
Least Valuable session:	Evaluation or consultation	Administration	Other	No Answer	
	5	1	4	9	
Was an area NOT covered which you wanted covered?	Yes	No			
	6	0			
Was the presentation clear?	Yes	No			
	19	0			
Was presentation AT, BELOW, or ABOVE the level of participant?	At	Below	Above	No Answer	
	14	4	0	1	
	Poor	Adequate	Good	Excellent	
Content was:	0	3	6	10	
Presentation was:	0	4	5	10	

question) said that presentation was below their level (Question 9.). It should be noted that three of the four persons who responded "below" held doctoral degrees.

5. Overall rating of content and presentation (poor, adequate, good, excellent) again showed a marked relation to educational level. The only ratings below "Good" were by doctoral degree holders plus one master's degree holder (Question 12.).

Evaluation Technique Assessment

The philosophy of this evaluation effort has been, from its inception, somewhat different from traditional evaluations. In the past, emphasis has been placed almost totally upon the "products" of programs. Many of the techniques for assessing products have not yielded usable findings. In addition, the "process" of programs has been excluded from view. The questions "What took place?" or "What happened?" can at times be more usefully answered in terms of processes than in products.

The evaluation team has concluded that, in an overall sense, this type of approach to evaluation does generate a quantity and quality of data from which useful conclusions can be drawn.

The team intentionally began the evaluation with more instruments and procedures than were needed. This was done in an effort to obtain more information about which ones would be more useful and which would be less useful. As the evaluation progressed, various modifications were made.

The first modifications came much earlier than anticipated. The strong reaction of the participants during Workshop V necessitated extensive change in evaluation activities. Although the participants reactions were determined by multiple factors, the trigger and the focus of much of their discontent was the evaluation effort itself.

The group was most adament about the Rotter test, and results from that test were destroyed. The Rotter test does offer many possibilities for comparisons, both across group and across individual. It is probable that with enough prior preparation of the group in terms of attitude, this test could still be utilized to good advantage.

Along with the discontinuance of the use of the Rotter there was a joint decision by the team and Dr. Keister toward generally lessening the load on the participants and toward preserving more anonymity. One of the largest cut-backs involved asking participants to assess fewer publications. It had been originally felt that such assessments merely added five minutes of worthwhile reflection to the scanning or skimming of a piece of material, of value in its own right to the participant. The team still holds this opinion, and yet a reduction of the overall load was necessary.

In an effort to insure the anonymity of participants the team eliminated all use of specific identities on the various forms used in the evaluation. There is no doubt that participant co-operation was increased to some extent by these changes. But at the same time most of the possibilities for comparisons by sub-groupings (based on falling into one category on one measure and another category on another measure) were eliminated.

The attention measure continued to be useful. With the necessity for identifying specific individuals eliminated, the measurement of attention became more efficient. It was discovered that as many as 4 - 6 persons could be rated simultaneously if they were seated in close proximity to one another. Also, attention ratings were possible from a position almost directly behind the individual at times without loss of reliability. Attention had to be redefined to include the note taking since that function may be even more important at times than gazing at the leader.

As occurs in most efforts of this type several minor changes of the organization and structure of several of the test items were made during the course of the evaluation in an effort to make them more easily used by participants and evaluators alike. A more basic alteration was found to be advantageous in the case of the Flanders interaction analysis, however. The categories "Student talk--response" and "Student talk-initiation" were valuable in themselves. Breaking each of these categories down further into subcategories of "question" and "statement" provided extra amounts of information without adding significant effort on the part of the rater. In addition, noting the sequence of interactions by simple numerical order was found to be easy to accomplish. The team is still exploring the possible uses and analyses of this extra information. The amount of usable data from the Flanders proved quite good. The rating procedure is time-consuming but worthwhile.

The analysis of the group as a whole left mixed reactions among the evaluators. Having the requirement of completing that particular form and given the extra space on it for comments did offer opportunity to contemplate and record some valuable information about the group which might otherwise have been lost. This aspect of the group-as-a-whole procedure was especially useful with Workshop V. On the other hand, there is some real question as to whether any of the three Workshop groups ever progressed beyond the first or second stage of group development. As presently managed there is clearly some moving closer among individuals in the group ever the duration of a Workshop. If more learner-centered techniques were utilized, the rate and amount of this movement might increase. The team feels that learning would be served by such a shift, thus making the group-as-a whole measure more essential.

Recommendations

1. Expectations regarding the evaluation of a workshop should be spelled out beforehand by building them into the original contract or application form. In other words, the participants should get in the mail some detailed information regarding their evaluation of material, their filling out of some forms, their answering short questionnaires, and soforth. They should know before they come what is expected of them and what they will get in return.
2. We should continue using the Rotter, but use it anonymously and derive a group score or measure. This will do much to cut down the anxiety and hostility on the part of participants.
3. Promise the partipants a mailed report only. The time period does not permit feedback by the last day of the workshop.
4. Should keep record of who is absent from each session.
5. Related to #1 it would be good to get the applicants to comment on the application (or elsewhere) what their expectations of the workshop are, or perhaps, what they hope to gain from the workshop might be a better phrase to use.
6. Some changes in the structure of some of the forms should be made.

REFERENCES

Amidon, E. J. and Flanders, N. A. (Eds.) Interaction analysis: theory, research and application. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1967.

Bion, W. R. Experiences in groups. N. Y.: Basic Books, 1959.

Campbell, D. T. and Stanley, J. C. Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for research in teaching. In N. L. Gage (Ed.) Handbook of research in teaching. N. Y.: Rand McNally, 1963.

Flanders, N. A. Interaction Analysis in the Classroom. Minneapolis, Minn.: University of Minnesota, 1960.

Kindelsperger, W. L., Ryland, G. and Wilson, G. New developments in theory and practive of social group work. N. Y.: Council of Social Work Education, 1956. Part 1.

Rotter, J. B. Generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcement. Psychological Monographs: General and Applied, 1966, 30(1), 1-28.

The use of groups in social welfare settings. A Workshop Report, New Orleans, School of Social Work, Tulane University, Aug., 1957.